

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering this application. Applicants request reconsideration of this application in view the remarks to follow.

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 11, 19, 25, 31, and 33 being the independent claims.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

At pages 2-5, the Office Action rejects Claims 1-5, 7, 10-15, 17, 19-21, 23, 25-27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,958).

Furthermore, at pages 6-9, the Office Action rejects various further claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al. in view of other references; in particular, Claims 6, 22, and 28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lo et al. in view of Evans et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0083016), Claims 8, 9, and 16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lo et al. in view of Nakamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,563), and Claims 18, 24, and 30 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lo et al. in view of Yoon (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,956). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants initially note that the rejections of all of the claims mentioned above incorporate the rejections of independent Claim 1, 11, 19, or 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Therefore, Applicants will address limitations of these independent claims, which will also serve to distinguish their respective dependent claims from the cited prior art.

Claims 1 and 11 include "a switch adapted to couple each of at least two receiver chains to one of at least two of plurality of antennas, *said switch being further adapted to couple said receiver chains to said plurality of antennas such that each receiver chain is coupled to a different one of said plurality of antennas.*" (Emphasis added.) The Office Action asserts that Fig. 2, element 210 of Lo et al. corresponds to the claimed switch. However, it is respectfully submitted that this switch cannot correspond to the claimed switch because *it does not couple each receiver chain to a different antenna.* In particular, Applicants note that Fig. 2 includes element 205, which is described at col. 3, lines 7-16 as being an analog beamformer network. Element 205 is located between the antennas and element 210. As described at col. 3, lines 7-16, element 205 serves *to combine the various antenna outputs*, via a matrix, into a plurality of beams. It is these beams that are then switched by element 210. Therefore, element 210 does not couple each of at least two receiver chains to a different one of a plurality of antennas, as recited in these claims. Therefore, Lo et al. does not anticipate Claims 1 and 11, as it does not disclose all elements of these claims.

For at least these reasons, Claims 1 and 11, as well as their dependent claims, Claims 2-10 and 12-18, respectively, are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 19 and 25 similarly recite that each of a number of receiver chains receives a different signal from a different selected antenna. Therefore, similarly, Lo et al. does not anticipate these claims, for the same reason (i.e., Lo et al. does not disclose all elements of these claims).

For at least these reasons, Claims 19 and 25, as well as their dependent claims, Claims 20-24 and 26-30, respectively, are allowable over the cited prior art.

At page 5, the Office Action rejects Claims 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoon (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,956). At page 9, the Office Action rejects Claims 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoon in view of Tsien et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0166394). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants note that the rejections of all of Claims 32 and 34 incorporate the rejections of independent Claims 31 and 33, respectively, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Therefore, Applicants will address limitations of these independent claims, which will also serve to distinguish their respective dependent claims from the cited prior art.

Claims 31 and 33 recite "adjusting a data rate of a signal transmitted by a first transceiver employing diversity combining *to compensate for a lack of use of diversity combining at a second transceiver.*" (Emphasis added.) Yoon, noting col. 3, lines 23-51 and Table 2 discusses a transceiver system that is switchable between high data rate and low data rate modes of operation. However, *nowhere in Yoon is it disclosed that such switching is performed to compensate for the lack of use of diversity combining at a second transceiver.* For at least this reason, Yoon does not anticipate Claims 31 and 33.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 31 and 33, as well as their respective dependent claims, Claims 32 and 34, are allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants respectfully state that the above discussion is not to be understood as including all possible arguments, and therefore, Applicants' electing not to address a particular element of the Office Action should not be understood as indicating concurrence with the characterizations of the claims or of the cited prior art found in the Office Action. Applicants acknowledge that there may be additional reasons for which the various claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and Applicants' election not to address such reasons at this time should not be understood as a concurrence with the Office Action or as a waiver of the right to argue such reasons at a later date.

Applicant: LIN et al.
Appl. No. 10/734,198


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and objections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 18, 2006



Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Direct Dial: (202) 344-8017
Telefax: (202) 344-8300